

REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview granted to applicant's representatives Marc A. Berger (Reg. No. 44,029) and Marc A. Sockol (Reg. No. 40,823). The interview was held by telephone on Thursday, November 18, 2004. Applicant has amended the claim language as discussed with the Examiner during the interview.

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 12 - 15, 18, 27 - 30 and 33 are presented for examination.

Applicant notes that one of the claims listed in the amendment filed on June 18, 2004 was erroneously mis-labeled. Specifically, claim 33 was labeled as "original", but should have been labeled as "currently amended".

In Paragraphs 1 - 5 of the Office Action, claims 12- 14, 18, 27 - 39 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Scherpbier, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,365 ("Scherpbier").

Applicant notes that claim 33 is not addressed in Paragraphs 3 - 5, and applicant's understanding is that the Examiner's intent is to include claim 33 in Paragraph 3.

In Paragraphs 6 - 8 of the Office Action, claims 15 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherpbier.

Scherpbier describes a method and system in which a primary computer, referred to as a "pilot," controls web pages displayed on one or more secondary computers, referred to as "passengers." Through mediation of a control computer, the pilot computer generates a sequence of web pages, referred to as a "flight plan" and, as the pilot computer requests successive web pages from the flight plan, the pages are synchronously displayed on the pilot and on the passenger computers. Scherpbier describes use of a username and password when the pilot computer desires to initialize a flight.

An important distinction between the paradigm of the present invention and that of Scherpbier is that the present invention assigns a password to an applet, whereas Scherpbier assigns a password to a user; namely, the user of the pilot computer. Thus, unlike Scherpbier, using the present invention,

- (i) the applet can be copied from one computer to multiple other computers and will execute on all of the computers, as long as the applet's password has not been invalidated;
- (ii) different users can run the same applet, as long as the applet's password has not been invalidated;
- (iii) a single user cannot run the applet after the applet's password has been invalidated; and
- (iv) an applet can be invalidated in the middle of a session.

Using the present invention, a server that stores proprietary data checks the applet password for validation whenever the applet requests proprietary information from the server. Thus, as illustrated in the lower two directional arrows in FIG. 6 of the present specification, when the applet running on client computer 66 requests information from server computer 64, the password is also transmitted to server 64 along with the request for information. Server 64 only provides the requested information if the applet's password is validated.

In distinction, within the system of Scherpbier, once the pilot computer sends a username and password to the control computer in step 32 of FIG. 2 and is validated at step 36, the pilot computer can navigate an entire flight plan, as in steps 70 – 100 of FIG. 5, including many requests to the control computer, without further password validation.

To further clarify the above distinction, applicant has amended independent claims 12 and 27 to include the limitation that (i) the password is received by the server and authenticated whenever the applet makes a request for restricted access information, and (ii) the password has a limited operational life.


In Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner, citing col. 4, lines 45 – 49 of Scherpbier, indicates that Scherpbier discloses providing a program applet with a password embedded therein. Applicant respectfully submits that the pilot applet of Scherpbier does not have a password embedded therein – which is why a user of the pilot computer must submit his user name and password.

In Paragraph 3 of the Office Action the Examiner, citing col. 4, lines 47 – 49 of Scherpbier, further indicates that Scherpbier discloses automatically receiving from the program applet the embedded password. Applicant respectfully submits that Scherpbier requires manual entry of a username and password, as indicated at step 34 of FIG. 2. Independent claims 1 and 27 of the present invention recite the limitation “without manual entry of the password by a user.”

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 19, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


By: 

Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,823

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

Date: Nov. 19, 2004 By: 
Cathi L.G. Thorsell

PaloAlto/76006.1